

R E M A R K S

1. Reconsideration and further prosecution of the above-identified application are respectfully requested in view of the discussion that follows. Claims 1-25 are pending in this application.

Claims 1-3 and 11-25 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,923,745 to Hurd in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,751,795 to Hassler et al. Claims 4-10 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Hurd in view of Hassler et al. and U.S. Pat. No. 5,335,268 to Kelly, Jr. et al. After a careful review of the claims (as amended), it has been concluded that the rejections are in error and the rejections are, therefore, traversed.

2. Claims 1-25 have been rejected as being obvious over Hurd in view of Hassler et al. In response, independent claims 1, 11 and 21 have been further limited to "broadcasting a message received by the first peripheral from a source peripheral to other peripherals of the automatic call distributor when the message table indicates that the message should be forwarded and, otherwise, deleting the message when a comparison of the indicia within the message table with a content of the message indicates that the message should be deleted". Support for the further limitations may be found at numerous locations throughout the specification (e.g., page 6, lines 3-10).

In contrast, Hurd and Hassler et al. merely routes calls. As would be abundantly clear to those of skill in the art, the broadcasting or deletion of a message is an entirely different concept than the routing of a call. Nowhere within Hurd or Hassler et al. is there any teaching or suggestion of a message table that contains indicia of a type of message that determines whether a message is broadcasted or deleted. Since

Hurd and Hassler et al. fail to provide any teaching of the claimed message table used for broadcasting and deleting messages, any rejection based upon the combination of Hurd and Hassler et al. would now be improper and should be withdrawn.


3. Claims 4-10 has been rejected as being obvious over Hurd in view of Hassler et al. and Kelly, Jr. et al. However, Kelly, Jr. et al. also fails to provide any teaching of the claimed message table used for broadcasting and deleting messages. Since Kelly, Jr. et al. fails to provide any teaching of the claimed message table used for broadcasting and deleting messages, the combination fails to teach each and every claim element. Since the combination fails to teach each and every claim element, any rejection based upon Hurd, Hassler et al. and Kelly, Jr. et al. would now be improper and should be withdrawn.

4. Allowance of claims 1-25, as now presented, is believed to be in order and such action is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner be of the opinion that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of the subject application, he is respectfully requested to telephone applicant's undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

WELSH & KATZ, LTD.

By



Jon P. Christensen
Registration No. 34,137

April 7, 2005
WELSH & KATZ, LTD.
120 South Riverside Plaza
22nd Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 655-1500